Maryland Historical Trust

Maryland Inventory of Historic Properties number: F-8-154
Name: 10172/MD75 or Heines Branch.
The bridge referenced herein was inventoried by the Maryland State Highway Administration as part of the Historic Bridge Inventory, and SHA provided the Trust with eligibility determinations in February 2001. The Trust accepted the Historic Bridge Inventory on April 3, 2001. The bridge received the following determination of eligibility.
MARYLAND HISTORICAL TRUST Eligibility Recommended Eligibility Not Recommended X
Criteria:ABCD Considerations:ABCDEFGNone
Comments:

F-9-154 MHT No. F-4-107

MARYLAND INVENTORY OF HISTORIC BRIDGES HISTORIC BRIDGE INVENTORY MARYLAND STATE HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION/MARYLAND HISTORICAL TRUST

SHA Bridge No. 10172 Bridge name MD 75 over Haines Branch	
LOCATION: Street/Road name and number [facility carried] Md 75	
City/town Union Bridge Vicinity	X
County Frederick	
This bridge projects over: Road Railway Water X Land	
Ownership: State X County Municipal Other	
HISTORIC STATUS: Is the bridge located within a designated historic district? Yes No X National Register-listed district National Register-determined-eligible district Other	ict
Name of district BRIDGE TYPE: Timber Bridge: Beam Bridge: Truss -Covered Trestle Timber-And-Concret	 te
Stone Arch Bridge	
Metal Truss Bridge	
Movable Bridge: Swing Bascule Single Leaf Ba Multiple Leaf Vertical Lift Retractile Pontoon	iscule
Metal Girder: Rolled Girder: Plate Girder: Rolled Girder Concrete Encased	
Metal Suspension	
Metal Arch	
Metal Cantilever	
Concrete X : Concrete Arch Concrete Slab X Concrete Beam Rigid Frame Other Type Name	

F-8-154

DESC	CRI	PTI	on

Setting: Urban _____ Small town X Rural _____

Describe Setting: Bridge No. 10172 carries MD 75 over Haines Branch approximately one mile south of Union Bridge in eastern Frederick County. The setting consists of fields which have been cleared for farming.

Describe Superstructure and Substructure:

Bridge No. 10172 carries traffic on MD 75 north and south over Haines Branch. The bridge has one 20' concrete slab span, a total length of 23' and a clear roadway width of 24'. It rests on concrete abutments and concrete wingwalls. The structure's live load design and date built are unknown. The east parapet has been replaced by a jersey barrier as a result of an auto accident in 1990. The west parapet wall is solid with decorative panelling. This bridge originally conformed to standard 1924 State Highway Administration plans dated 1924.

According to a summary of an inspection conducted in June 1991, the top of the southeast wingwall was broken and was lying in the stream; other wingwalls had some cracking and scaling.

The underside of the slab had random cracks and some efflorescence. The roadway is in good condition.

Discuss Major Alterations:

The east parapet was removed after being damaged in an auto accident in 1990. It has been replaced by a Jersey type barrier.

HISTORY:

WHEN was the bridge built 1930

This date is: Actual Estimated X

Source of date: Plaque _____ Design plans ____ County bridge files/inspection form _____

Other (specify): SHA files

WHY was the bridge built?

The need for a more efficient transportation network and increased load capacity in the decades following World War I.

WHO was the designer?

State Highway Administration

WHO was the builder?

State Highway Administration

WHY was the bridge altered?

Jersey type barriers replaced the east parapet in 1990 after an auto accident damaged the bridge.

Was this bridge built as part of an organized bridge-building campaign?

As part of an effort by the State to increase load capacity on secondary roads during the 1930's.

SURVEYOR/HISTORIAN ANALYSIS:

This bridge may have Natio	onal Register significan	ice for its association with:
A - Events	B- Person	
C- Engineering/arch	itectural character	

This bridge does not have National Register significance.

Was the bridge constructed in response to significant events in Maryland or local history?

Reinforced concrete slab bridges are a twentieth century structure type, easily adapted to the need for expedient engineering solutions. Reinforced concrete technology developed rapidly in the early twentieth century with early recognition of the potential for standardized design. The first U.S. attempt to standardize concrete design specifications came in 1903-04 with the formation of the Joint Committee on Concrete and Reinforced Concrete of the American Society of Civil Engineers.

Maryland's road and bridge improvement programs mirrored economic cycles. The first road improvement program of the State Roads Commission was a 7 year program, starting with the Commission's establishment in 1908 and ending in 1915. Due to World War I, the period from 1916 -1920 was one of relative inactivity; only roads of first priority were built. Truck traffic resulting from war-related factories and military installations generated new, heavy traffic unanticipated by the builders of the early road system. From 1920 to 1929, numerous highway improvements occurred in response to the increase in Maryland motor vehicles from 103,000 in 1920 to 320,000 in 1929, with emphasis on the secondary system of feeder roads which moved traffic from the primary roads built before World War I. After World War I, Maryland's bridge system also was appraised as too narrow and structurally inadequate for the increasing traffic, with plans for an expanded bridge program to be handled by the Bridge Division, set up in 1920. In 1920 under Chapter 508 of the Acts of 1920 the State issued a bond of \$3,000,000.00 for road construction; the primary purpose of these monies was to meet the state obligations involving the construction of rural post roads. The secondary purpose of these monies was to fund [with an equal sum from the counties] the building of lateral roads. The number of hard surfaced roads on the state system grew from 2000 in 1920 to 3200 in 1930. By 1930, Maryland's primary system had become inadequate to the huge freight trucks and volume of passenger cars in use, with major improvements occurring in the late 1930s. Most improvements to local roads waited until the years after World War II.

With a diverse topographical domain encompassing numerous small and large crossings, Maryland engineers quickly recognized the need for expedient design and construction.

In the early years, there was a need to replace the numerous single lane timber bridges. Walter Wilson Crosby, Chief Engineer stated in 1906, "The general plan has been to replace these [wood bridges] with pipe culverts or concrete bridges and thus forever do way with the further expense of the maintenance of expensive and dangerous wooden structures". Within a few years, readily constructed standardized bridges of concrete were being built throughout the state.

The creation of standard plans and a description of their use was first announced in the 1912-15 Reports of the State Roads Commission whereby bridges spanning up to 36 feet were to use standardized designs.

Published on a single sheet, the 1912 Standard Plans included those structures that were amenable to such an approach: slab spans, (deck) girder spans, box culverts, box bridges, abutments, and piers

F-8-154 F-4-161

(State Roads Commission 1912). Slab spans, with lengths of 6 to 16 feet in two foot increments, featured a solid parapet that was integrated into the slab, with a roadway of 22 feet.

In the Report for the years 1916-1919, a revision of the standard plans was noted:

During the four years covered by this report, it has been found necessary to revise our standard plans for culverts and bridges, to take care of the increased tonnage which they have been forced to carry. Army cantonments...increased their operations several hundred per cent, and the brunt of the enormous truck traffic resulting therefrom, was borne by the State Roads of Maryland. In addition to these war activities, freight motor lines from Baltimore to Washington, Philadelphia, New York, and various points throughout Maryland, and the weight of many of these trucks when loaded, was in excess of the loads for which our early bridges were designed (State Roads Commission 1920:56).

Published on separate sheets, the new standard plans (State Roads Commission 1919) for slab bridges reveal that the major changes was an increase in roadway width from 22 feet to 24 feet and a redesign of the reinforcement. The slab spans continued to feature solid parapets integrated into the span. The range of span lengths remained 6 to 16 feet, but the next year (1920) witnessed the issue of a supplemental plan for a 20 foot long slab span (State Roads Commission 1920).

The 1924 standard plans remained in effect until 1930, when the roadway width for all standard plan bridges was increased to 27 feet in order to accommodate the increasing demands of automobile and truck traffic (State Roads Commission 1930). The range of span lengths remained the same, but there were some changes designed to increase load bearing capacities. The reinforcing bars were increased in thickness. Visually, the 1930 design can be distinguished from its predecessors by the pierced concrete railing that was introduced at this time.

When the bridge was built and/or given a major alteration, did it have a significant impact on the growth and development of the area?

There is no evidence that the construction of this bridge had a significant impact on the growth and development of this area. The area around the bridge appears to be undeveloped.

Is the bridge located in an area which may be eligible for historic designation and would the bridge add to or detract from the historic/visual character of the potential district? This bridge is not located in a potential district.

Is the bridge a significant example of its type?

This bridge is not a significant example of its type.

Does the bridge retain integrity of important elements described in Context Addendum? No, the east parapet has been replaced with a jersey type barrier.

Is the bridge a significant example of the work of a manufacturer, designer, and/or engineer? The bridge was designed according to standardized State plans dated 1924.

Should the bridge be given further study before an evaluation of its significance is made? No further evaluation is necessary to determine National Register significance.

F-8-154

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

County inspection/bridge files

SHA inspection/bridge files X

Other (list):

SURVEYOR:

Date bridge recorded 8/95


Name of surveyor Leo Hirrell

Organization/Address P.A.C. Spero & Company, 40 W. Chesapeake Avenue, Suite 412, Baltimore,

Maryland 21204

Phone number 410-296-1635

FAX number 410-296-1670







Inventory # $F-8-154$
Name 10172 - MO75 OVER HAINES BRANCH County/State FREDERICK COUNTY/MD
Name of Photographer FRANK JULIANO Date
Date 2/05
Location of Negative SHA
Description APPROACH WEST
Number 22 35 4



Inventory	#	F-	8-15	7

Name 10172-MOTSOVER HAINES BRANCH County/State FREDERICK COUNTY/MD Name of PhotographerFRANK JUMANO DateZ/95
Location of Negative SHA

Description ELEVATION LOOKING NORTH

23_{of} 35 4



Inventory # $\overline{F-8-154}$
Name 10172 - MONS OVER HAINES BRANCH
County/State FREDERICK COUNTY/MP
Name of Photographer FRANK JULIANO
Date 7 95
Location of Negative SUA
Description RPPROACH EAST
Number 24 of 35 4



	<u> </u>
- 10.	FREDERICK COUNTY MD tographer FRANK JULIANO
Date	45_
Location of N	Negative SHA
Description	ELEVATION LOOKING SOUTH
Number 25	of 354